# U.S. Department of Education 2009 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

'ype of School: (Check all that apply) [X] Elementary [] Middle [] High [] K-12 [] Other
[] Charter [X] Title I [] Magnet [] Choice
Tame of Principal: Mr. Matthew Davidson
Official School Name: <u>Burlington Elementary School</u>
chool Mailing Address: 109 School Ave PO Box 9 Burlington, WY 82411-0009
County: Big Horn County State School Code Number*: 597
elephone: (307) 762-3604 Fax: (307) 762-3604
Web site/URL: <a href="http://bighorn1.bgh1.k12.wy.us/htmlpages/schlsdirectory.html">http://bighorn1.bgh1.k12.wy.us/htmlpages/schlsdirectory.html</a> E-mail: <a href="mailto:ndavidson@bgh1.k12.wy.us">http://bighorn1.bgh1.k12.wy.us</a>
have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - ligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.
Date
Principal's Signature)
Principal's Signature)
Principal's Signature)  Tame of Superintendent*: Mr. Shon Hocker
Principal's Signature)  Jame of Superintendent*: Mr. Shon Hocker  District Name: Big Horn Coutny School District #1 Tel: (307) 548-2254  have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - ligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.
Principal's Signature)  Jame of Superintendent*: Mr. Shon Hocker  District Name: Big Horn Coutny School District #1  Tel: (307) 548-2254  That reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I -
Principal's Signature)  Jame of Superintendent*: Mr. Shon Hocker  District Name: Big Horn Coutny School District #1 Tel: (307) 548-2254  That reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - ligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.  Date
Principal's Signature)  Jame of Superintendent*: Mr. Shon Hocker  District Name: Big Horn Coutny School District #1 Tel: (307) 548-2254  Thave reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I ligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.  Date
Principal's Signature)  fame of Superintendent*: Mr. Shon Hocker  District Name: Big Horn Coutny School District #1 Tel: (307) 548-2254  Thave reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - ligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.  Date

<sup>\*</sup>Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

Original signed cover sheet only should be mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as USPS Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

## PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

- 1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
- 3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2008-2009 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
- 4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
- 5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2003.
- 6. The nominated school has not received the No Child Left Behind Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, or 2008.
- 7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

**DISTRICT** (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1.	Number of schools in the district:	2	Elementary schools
		1	Middle schools
		1	Junior high schools
		2	High schools
			Other
		6	TOTAL
2.	District Per Pupil Expenditure: <u>16070</u> Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: <u>1214</u>	<u> 18</u>	
SCI	HOOL (To be completed by all schools)		
3.	Category that best describes the area where t	he school	is located:

Γ	Urban or large central city
_	Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
-	Suburban
ĺΣ	Small city or town in a rural area
ĺ	l Rural

4. 10 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	12	3	15	7			0
K	9	7	16	8			0
1	5	10	15	9			0
2	8	9	17	10			0
3	8	9	17	11			0
4	7	7	14	12			0
5	8	12	20	Other			0
6	17	4	21				ľ
	TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL						135

		1 % Black of Tillican	mineric	uii
		14 % Hispanic or Latin	o	
		2 % Native Hawaiian	or Othe	er Pacific Islander
		83 % White		
		% Two or more race	S	
		100 % Total		
fina Edu	al Guidance on Maintaining,	es should be used in reporting the racial/eth Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic per 19, 2007 <i>Federal Register</i> provides defi	data to	the U.S. Department of
7.	Student turnover, or mobility	rate, during the past year: 10 %		
TPL:			4	
1 m	s rate is calculated using the	grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobili	ty rate.	
	(1	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	9	
	(2	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	4	
	(3	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	13	
	(4	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	135	
	(5	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.096	
	(6	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	9.630	
8.	Limited English proficient s	rudents in the school: <u>4</u> %		
	Total number limited Englis	h proficient5_		
	Number of languages repres Specify languages:	ented: <u>1</u>		
Spa	unish			

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

% American Indian or Alaska Native

% Asian

9.	Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals	s: <u>50</u> %		
	Total number students who qualify	: _68_		
the s	is method does not produce an accurate estimate, the school does not participate in the free and redunate, tell why the school chose it, and explain	ced-price school meals prog	gram, specify a n	
10.	Students receiving special education services:	11%		
	Total Number of Students Served:15_			
	cate below the number of students with disabil Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additi	•	s designated in t	he Individuals
	1 Autism	0 Orthopedic Impa	irment	
	0 Deafness	2 Other Health Imp	paired	
	0 Deaf-Blindness	4 Specific Learnin	g Disability	
	0 Emotional Disturbance	8 Speech or Langu	age Impairment	
	0 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain	Injury	
	0 Mental Retardation	0 Visual Impairme	nt Including Bli	ndness
	0 Multiple Disabilities	0 Developmentally	Delayed	
11.	Indicate number of full-time and part-time sta	aff members in each of the o	categories below	<b>7:</b>
			Number	of Staff
			Full-Time	<u>Part-Time</u>
				0

<b>Full-Time</b>	<b>Part-Time</b>
1	0
8	3
4	1
1	0
2	0
16	4
	1 8 4 1 2

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 17:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Daily student attendance	96%	95%	95%	96%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	95%	98%	97%	96%	95%
Teacher turnover rate	12%	12%	19%	12%	6%

Please provide all explanations below.

In 2005-06 we had a reduction in staff brought about by budget reductions.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2008 are doing as of the Fall 2008.

Graduating class size	0	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0 %	б
Enrolled in a community college	0 %	б
Enrolled in vocational training	0 %	б
Found employment	0 %	б
Military service	0 %	б
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	0 %	б
Unknown	0 %	б
Total	100 %	б
	· ·	

## PART III - SUMMARY

Burlington Elementary is a Pre-K - 6th grade school serving a rural community in the middle of the Big Horn Basin in northern Wyoming. Family support for education is positive. We are a Title I Schoolwide elementary with dedicated and effective teachers. Our school's mission is to provide a positive environment for all students with opportunities to learn, develop, and utilize the skills necessary for success.

#### To achieve this mission:

- 1. We focus on sound instructional and assessment practices for all students.
- 2. We value all aspects of the child including academic, social, physical, and emotional development.
- 3. We promote self-worth, responsibility, productivity, citizenship, and a tradition of excellence.

Over the past 10 years we have seen steady growth in reading, writing, and math achievement. During this time, we have organized our school into leadership teams with each staff member being an integral part of one of these teams. Each leadership team has a member representative on the school improvement team. These teams have identified areas for improvement and have set goals for growth. Then we develop action plans with identified strategies to achieve the goals. This process continues to refine, and presently we are effective in analyzing data and determining where we need to intervene for targeted improvement.

We also have developed a climate of civility and success. Adults communicate, collaborate, and celebrate together. Students and parents are active participants in celebrations of successes.

Our school is the hub of the community. We encourage parental involvement on a regular basis. They are key to our success. We consistently try to keep parents informed and involved. They are frequently in the classroom. We provide trainings relating to our curricular programs to enable them to assist their children successfully.

We believe that all of us are learners in our school including the principal, teachers, support staff, parents, and students. We have established a learning community which promotes continual learning for everyone. This culture sends the message that learning is important and expected.

## PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

#### 1. Assessment Results:

The Wyoming Department of Education assessment tool from 1999 to 2005 was WyCAS (Wyoming Comprehensive Assessment System) and was administered in grades 4, 8, and 11. Reading, writing, and math were assessed. Since 2006, PAWS (Proficiency Assessment for Wyoming Students) has been used to measure AYP. PAWS is given in grades 3 through 8 and grade 11. Reading, writing, math, and now science are assessed.

Four proficiency levels are determined through PAWS—Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic. A proficient level indicates that a student has mastered the knowledge and skills elicited by grade level standards. An advanced level indicates understanding or growth beyond the expected level. Basic and Below Basic indicate levels of non-mastery with only partial or minimal understanding of those standards.

During the past five years, Burlington Elementary has met AYP and scored above the state average. We have seen growth in reading, writing, and math scores. School improvement efforts have been developed and monitored based on student levels of achievement. This process of using the state assessment as an instructional tool has proved to be effective in our school.

### 2. Using Assessment Results:

Data is a guide for decision making in our school. We use multiple assessments including district standard assessments, growth based assessments, and PAWS, our state assessment, to monitor program and school growth. We also use progress monitoring assessments to look at specific subject areas such as reading. We disaggregate the data by identified subgroups and monitor the progress of these groups over time as they relate to our school improvement goals.

This year for example, we have identified basic and proficient writers as two subgroups who need attention. We are implementing interventions to move the proficient writers to advanced and the basic writers to proficient. Data from PAWS, our state assessment, was used to identify this need.

In reading, we use DIBELS to monitor the progress of individual readers. We seek to intervene with struggling readers as early as possible with individualized, targeted instruction to bring them up to grade level. This has been very successful for us over the past five years.

Several times each year, our school improvement team looks at schoolwide results to monitor school level progress. We use trend data over time to see patterns and areas of success or need. This information is shared with classroom teachers who use the data to set specific classroom instructional goals. This process helps us monitor improvement efforts over a period of years.

#### 3. Communicating Assessment Results:

Several years ago we developed a standard-based report card. This has provided an excellent avenue for keeping parents informed about their child's progress with relation to district standard assessments. As assessments are given, scores are entered and aggregated in our management system. When report cards are printed, individual standards show proficiency levels based on the assessments scores which have been entered. This management system also allows parents to receive weekly progress reports via email.

After PAWS, the Wyoming State Assessment, scores are returned, they are sent with a letter to parents along with a description of what the information means. Parents are invited to discuss the information with the child's

teacher or the principal. Students are shown their individual scores and each teacher visits with them about the information. Scores are also reported to local newspapers where they are published.

During parent teacher conferences twice each year, we review assessment data with students and parents. We discuss strengths and areas which need improvement. We show parents how information such as DIBELS scores is used to monitor progress.

Students are encouraged to set personal goals for growth in selected areas.

### 4. Sharing Success:

We have had a number of schools contact us about our PAWS scores and ask what we are doing instructionally. Several of these have visited our school and staff. We are eager to share and collaborate with other schools. We are presently building a better school website where we will post information about our school's efforts. We will invite schools to visit and appoint spokespeople for each of our subject areas to provide written information to schools which may solicit it. Twice each year, Wyoming hosts a school improvement conference for all schools and districts where promising and successful practices are shared. We could develop a session to offer during these conferences.

## PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

#### 1. Curriculum:

We have aligned our curriculum to state and district standards. Our instruction is aligned to these standards at each grade level in each subject area. Our curriculum teams have written assessments for each grade level that align to the standards for that grade and subject. Lesson objectives each day target benchmark skills which correlate to one of the content standards. This process has allowed us to prioritize instruction based on what has been dictated important in the way of standards.

Math-We emphasize math language and vocabulary starting in Kindergarten. We believe that students are becoming more confident in math because of the familiarity of the language used. We teach strategies for facts and encourage students to become fluent in basic facts. Each grade has points of emphasis with facts and students set personal fluency goals. Problem-solving strategies are taught and emphasized throughout all grades. Students journal and explain their problem-solving reasoning. This practice has helped students internalize math concepts. For the past three years, we have added a math flex time each day where students are creatively grouped to receive targeted instruction beyond the regular math period. All adults in the building are utilized to work with groups. This has proven effective in remediating and also extending learning.

Social studies- Standards are taught through a project based framework. Students often work as teams to complete the projects, which allows growth and development in cooperation and interpersonal skills. We try to emphasize the process of learning content as well as the content believing that we are preparing students to interact with rigorous texts in middle and high school.

Science-We approach science with a hands-on philosophy. Students are engaged in doing science as they learn science. We have developed a "science warehouse" where all of our pooled materials and equipment are available for teachers to access and use. Last year, we used gifted and talented dollars to purchase robotic units to provide a way to extend opportunities to students with interest. We also have begun a tradition of ending each year with a schoolwide science fair which has been a great experience for students and community members.

Language arts- Integration is an important process in our language arts instruction. Reading, writing, and speaking are integral components of every subject. We have dedicated and protected reading instruction time which is priority number one in our school.

Fine Arts- We offer general music to Preschool through grade 4. Fifth and sixth grades have band twice each week. Our school presents a holiday and spring concert and play each year. Students love these experiences. Each has a costume and involvement. The sixth graders take the lead speaking parts each year in the play portion of the program.

Foreign Language - We teach Spanish in grades K-2 in our elementary. This instruction is at a basic, introductory level.

### 2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

We are a Reading First School. This has been a positive endeavor for our school. We have had the best professional development over the past five years associated with the Reading First Program that I have ever been a part of as an educator. Teachers are confident in teaching reading. They know how to identify reading gaps and how to address individual differences. Students are monitored on a continual basis. Struggling readers are monitored biweekly. We feel that we need to keep careful track of how each is progressing. Grade level

teams meet to discuss efforts, progress, and needs. Instruction is planned and adjusted based on the data we gather and discuss.

We have a strong core reading program and intervention materials to support struggling readers. Reading is a priority in our school at every grade K-6th. We use flexible grouping to target instruction and to maximize teacher student ratios. Our goal is to have every student reading at grade level by the end of third grade. We are close to achieving this goal. We focus on alphabetic principle, phonemic awareness, oral reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension as the foundation for reading instruction.

We also encourage and support students reading at home every day. Each student sets personal goals for reading points each month. We celebrate met goals. We have developed some traditions which honor readers on our reading wall. These plaques remain as a reminder to younger students of who has gone before and what has been accomplished. It serves as a motivation to read.

#### 3. Additional Curriculum Area:

We believe that students need to master basic skills in math and become fluent in math language in order to become efficient and effective math problem solvers. Our math curriculum is aligned to district and state standards which are aligned to NCTM standards. In recent years, we have spent much time with vertical alignment between grade levels as well. Our goal has been to decide what each student should know and be able to do in math by the end of each grade level. The next grade seeks to build on this. We have emphasized vocabulary development and consistency in math language both orally and in written math work. Students are asked to explain their reasoning on a consistent basis. We have a dedicated math period each day and another shorter block of time for flexible grouping. During this time students may be re-taught, pre-taught, or extended.

#### 4. Instructional Methods:

We have worked to develop a creative schedule that maximizes the time and availability of all staff to work with groups of students to provide targeted instruction. We use flexible groups which we monitor and change frequently. In reading, we progress monitor biweekly for students who are not reading at grade level. We also carefully monitor program indicators such as skills tests. For students who need further evaluation, we use a diagnostic tool to identify skill areas to target. We have dedicated core reading time for all students. Then we have a grouping time where students are mixed and meet with a teacher who provides specific instruction geared to their needs. For lower students, we have another group time where they are pre-taught and reinforced to prepare for success the next day. Intervention programs are studied and show stringent research based evidence of success before we consider using them. For students who are more than a grade level behind, replacement core reading materials are considered in an effort to close the gap and catch the student up to peers in a timely manner.

We have a similar approach in math. However, to date we have identified fewer research based intervention programs. We use flexible grouping and creative scheduling to get the student to teacher ratio as low as possible during our grouping instruction.

All teachers look at group and individual learner needs as they plan and deliver instruction. We seek to challenge students who are excelling in a subject area by modifying assignments or extending them. During some group time, high learners dig deeper or explore related learning topics.

### 5. Professional Development:

Because we are a Reading First School, our professional development for reading instruction has been superior. All of our teachers have attended multiple trainings over several years in vocabulary and comprehension instruction, in using data to inform instruction, in phonological awareness, in fluency, and many other reading

topics. We have had experts provide onsite coaching to specialist teachers. We also have a literacy coach who continues onsite training for all teachers.

In the past five years, our district has offered professional development in differentiated instruction and writing across content areas. We are in our third year with brain friendly instructional teaching professional development. All teachers have had multiple days of in-service where these strategies have been modeled and practiced. They have been incorporated into every subject throughout the day. It has had a very positive impact on the learning environment. We believe some of our positive academic achievement has been tied to these efforts.

Currently, we are also studying assessment practices which impact teaching and learning. This is the first year of this initiative, but it is already changing the way we develop and use assessments.

## 6. School Leadership:

Leading is learning. The principal is the instructional lead learner of our school—the nucleus of our learning community. Our mission is to orchestrate a system which will enable, encourage, and empower children and adults to be successful learners. This is accomplished through attention to what we call The Three C's—culture, collaboration, and change.

#### Culture

We work continually to promote a culture for learning and caring for learners. Every decision that is made is bounced up against this question. How does it impact learning and learners? That includes instructional issues such as curricular programs and day-to-day issues like morning snacks. In our school everyone is a learner. We promote professional growth for all adults including custodians, secretaries, paraprofessionals, teachers, and myself. Caring for learners includes celebrations, effective communication, and clear expectations.

### Collaboration

Practicing shared leadership has allowed me to empower others to play important roles in our learning successes. In our community of learners, the system offers individuals with a variety of strengths. We try to harness those strengths through delegation. Each teacher is vitally involved in one of our school's leadership teams. These teams work collaboratively to develop, implement, and monitor improvement efforts. As an example, our writing achievement has increased dramatically since the writing leadership team has developed a plan for improvement and monitored its implementation.

#### Change

There is nothing as constant as change. We live in a world of change. Technology changes so quickly that it is nearly impossible to be current. Society and families are changing. Learners are changing. As a result of constant change teaching and learning must adapt. Our school views change as an opportunity for growth.

All of our efforts are geared toward student growth and achievement which we monitor constantly over time.

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: PAWS

Edition/Publication Year: 2006 Publisher: Harcourt

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar		
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	85		
% Advanced	29	53	24		
Number of students tested	14	17	21		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Econom	ic Disadvantag	ed Students	s		
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100			
% Advanced		46			
Number of students tested		11			
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Before PAWS, WyCAS was the State test which did not test third grade.

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: PAWS Edition/Publication Year: 2006 Publisher: Harcourt

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar		
SCHOOL SCORES			<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	88	81		
% Advanced	7	47	29		
Number of students tested	14	17	21		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic	ic Disadvantag	ed Students	s		
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91			
% Advanced		46			
Number of students tested		11			
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Prior to PAWS we had WyCAS which did not test at third grade.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: PAWS & WyCAS
Edition/Publication Year: 2006 & 2003 Publisher: Harcourt & Measured Progress

## SCHOOL SCORES    Proficient plus	Edition/Fublication Teal. 2000 & 2005					
## SCHOOL SCORES  % Proficient plus % Advanced   100   90   96   33   33   33   34   34   34   34   3		2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
% Proficient plus % Advanced       100       90       96       33       33         % Advanced       69       71       46       13       14         Number of students tested       16       21       24       15       21         Percent of total students tested       94       100       100       100       100         Number of students alternatively assessed       1   <t< td=""><td>Testing Month</td><td>Mar</td><td>Mar</td><td>Mar</td><td>Mar</td><td>Mar</td></t<>	Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
% Advanced         69         71         46         13         14           Number of students tested         16         21         24         15         21           Percent of total students alternatively assessed         1         100         100         100         100           Number of students alternatively assessed         6         8         8         100	SCHOOL SCORES					
Number of students tested	% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	90	96	33	33
Percent of total students tested 94 100 100 100 100 Number of students alternatively assessed 1	% Advanced	69	71	46	13	14
Number of students alternatively assessed 1 Percent of students alternatively assessed 6  SUBGROUP SCORES  1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students  % Proficient plus % Advanced 54 45 % Advanced 46 33 Number of students tested 13 15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced 8 % Advanced 8 Number of students tested 8  3. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced 8 % Advanced 8 Number of students tested 8  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced 8 % Advanced 8 Number of students tested 8  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced 8 %	Number of students tested	16	21	24	15	21
Percent of students alternatively assessed 6  SUBGROUP SCORES  1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students  % Proficient plus % Advanced 54 47  % Advanced 46 33  Number of students tested 13 15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced 8  % Advanced 8  Number of students tested 8  3. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced 8  Number of students tested 8  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced 8  Number of students tested 8  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced 8  % Proficient p	Percent of total students tested	94	100	100	100	100
SUBGROUP SCORES  1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students  % Proficient plus % Advanced 54 47  % Advanced 46 33  Number of students tested 13 15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced 9  % Advanced 9  Number of students tested 9  3. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced 9  % Advanced 9  Number of students tested 9  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced 9  % P	Number of students alternatively assessed	1				
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students  % Proficient plus % Advanced 54 47  % Advanced 46 33  Number of students tested 13 15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced 97  % Advanced 97  Number of students tested 97  3. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced 97  % Advanced 97  Number of students tested 97  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced 97  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced 97  % Pro	Percent of students alternatively assessed	6				
% Proficient plus % Advanced  % Advanced  % Advanced  \$ 46  \$ 33  Number of students tested  \$ 13  \$ 15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Advanced  Number of students tested  \$ 10	SUBGROUP SCORES					
% Advanced 46 33  Number of students tested 13 15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced	1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic	Disadvantag	ged Students	S		
Number of students tested 13 15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Proficient plus % Advanced			54		47
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Advanced			46		33
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced	Number of students tested			13		15
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced						
% Advanced Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Proficient plus % Advanced					
3. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	Number of students tested					
% Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	3. (specify subgroup):					
Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Proficient plus % Advanced					
4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	Number of students tested					
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced						
	-					
	-					

Notes:

PAWS replaced WyCAS as the State test.

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: PAWS & WyCAS
Edition/Publication Year: 2006 & 2003 Publisher: Harcourt & Measured Progress

Edition/Fublication Teal. 2000 & 200	2007-2008   2006-2007   2005-2006   2004-2005   2003					
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	
SCHOOL SCORES						
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	86	88	67	76	
% Advanced	50	57	29	20	38	
Number of students tested	16	21	24	15	21	
Percent of total students tested	94	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	1					
Percent of students alternatively assessed	6					
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Econom	ic Disadvantag	ed Student	S			
% Proficient plus % Advanced			95		80	
% Advanced			23		33	
Number of students tested			23		15	
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup)	:					
% Proficient plus % Advanced						
% Advanced						
Number of students tested						
3. (specify subgroup):						
% Proficient plus % Advanced						
% Advanced						
Number of students tested						
4. (specify subgroup):						
% Proficient plus % Advanced						
% Proficient plus % Advanced						
Number of students tested						
number of students tested						

Notes:

PAWS replaced WyCAS in Wyoming.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: PAWS Edition/Publication Year: 2006 Publisher: Harcourt

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	2001 2003	2003 2004
SCHOOL SCORES	14141	Maria	Mai		
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	100	85		
% Advanced	45	55	31		
Number of students tested	20	22	13		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	100	100	100		
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
referred of students afternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic	ic Disadvantag	ed Students	s		
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100			
% Advanced		58			
Number of students tested		12			
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):	1				
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

PAWS replaced WyCAS in 2006. WyCAS did not test at grade 5.

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: PAWS Edition/Publication Year: 2006 Publisher: Harcourt

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar		
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	100	69		
% Advanced	20	73	39		
Number of students tested	20	22	13		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic	ic Disadvantag	ed Students	3		
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100			
% Advanced		67			
Number of students tested		12			
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

PAWS replaced WyCAS in 2006. WyCAS did not test at grade 5.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 6 Test: PAWS Edition/Publication Year: 2006 Publisher: Harcourt

Edition/Fublication Teal, 2000	rublisher. Harcourt					
	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar			
SCHOOL SCORES						
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	80	77			
% Advanced	60	40	32			
Number of students tested	25	10	22			
Percent of total students tested	100	91	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed						
Percent of students alternatively assessed						
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Econom	ic Disadvantag	ed Student	S			
% Proficient plus % Advanced	77		80			
% Advanced	46		33			
Number of students tested	13		15			
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup)	:					
% Proficient plus % Advanced						
% Advanced						
Number of students tested						
3. (specify subgroup):						
% Proficient plus % Advanced						
% Advanced						
Number of students tested						
4. (specify subgroup):						
% Proficient plus % Advanced						
-						
% Proficient plus % Advanced						
Number of students tested						

Notes:

PAWS replaced WyCAS. WyCAS did not test sixth grade.

Subject: Reading Grade: 6 Test: PAWS Edition/Publication Year: 2006 Publisher: Harcourt

% Advanced 46 20 Number of students tested 13 15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced		2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
## SCHOOL SCORES    Proficient plus	Testing Month				2007-2003	2003-2004
% Proficient plus % Advanced       96       91       77         % Advanced       52       46       27         Number of students tested       100       100       100         Number of students alternatively assessed       100       100       100         Number of students alternatively assessed       100       100       100         SUBGROUP SCORES       1       100       100       100         SUBGROUP SCORES       1       100       100       100       100         BY Proficient plus % Advanced       92       60 <td>-</td> <td>Iviai</td> <td>Iviai</td> <td>iviai</td> <td></td> <td></td>	-	Iviai	Iviai	iviai		
% Advanced         52         46         27           Number of students tested         25         11         22           Percent of total students tested         100         100         100           Number of students alternatively assessed         Percent of students alternatively assessed         Percent of students alternatively assessed           SUBGROUP SCORES         1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students           % Proficient plus % Advanced         46         20           % Advanced         13         15           2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):         Proficient plus % Advanced         Proficient plus % Advanced           % Advanced         Number of students tested         Proficient plus % Advanced           % Proficient plus % Advanced         Proficient plus % Advanced           4. (specify subgroup):         4. (specify subgroup):           % Proficient plus % Advanced         Proficient plus % Advanced           % Proficient plus % Advanced         Proficient plus % Advanced		06	01	77		
Number of students tested 25 11 22 Percent of total students tested 100 100 100 100 Number of students alternatively assessed Percent of students Students Percent Office and Percent Office Advantaged Students Percent Office Advanced Percent Of	-		-			
Percent of total students tested  Number of students alternatively assessed  Percent of students alternatively assessed  Percent of students alternatively assessed  SUBGROUP SCORES  1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students  % Proficient plus % Advanced  92  60  % Advanced  13  15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Advanced  Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Advanced  Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Proficient plus % Advanced				-		
Number of students alternatively assessed  Percent of students alternatively assessed  SUBGROUP SCORES  1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students  % Proficient plus % Advanced  92  60  % Advanced  46  20  Number of students tested  13  15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Advanced  Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Advanced  Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Advanced  Number of students tested						
Percent of students alternatively assessed  SUBGROUP SCORES  1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students  % Proficient plus % Advanced  92 60 8 Advanced 46 20 Number of students tested 13 15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Advanced Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced		100	100	100		
SUBGROUP SCORES  1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students  % Proficient plus % Advanced 92 60  % Advanced 46 20  Number of students tested 13 15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced	•					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students   92	Percent of students alternatively assessed					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students   92						
% Proficient plus % Advanced       92       60         % Advanced       46       20         Number of students tested       13       15         2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):         % Proficient plus % Advanced       \$\text{\$\text{Mayanced}\$}\$         % Advanced       \$\text{\$\text{Number of students tested}\$}\$         3. (specify subgroup):       \$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{Mayanced}\$}\$}\$}\$         % Advanced       \$\text{\$\text{\$\text{Number of students tested}\$}\$         4. (specify subgroup):       \$\$\text{\$\te						
% Advanced  Number of students tested  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Advanced  Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Advanced  Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced	1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic	ic Disadvantag	ed Students	S		
Number of students tested 13 15  2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Proficient plus % Advanced	92		60		
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Advanced	46		20		
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced	Number of students tested	13		15		
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced						
% Advanced Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
Number of students tested  3. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Proficient plus % Advanced					
3. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	Number of students tested					
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced						
% Advanced Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	3. (specify subgroup):					
Number of students tested  4. (specify subgroup):  % Proficient plus % Advanced  % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Proficient plus % Advanced					
4. (specify subgroup): % Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	% Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	Number of students tested					
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced						
% Proficient plus % Advanced % Proficient plus % Advanced	4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced						
	_					

Notes:

PAWS replaced WyCAS. WyCAS did not test sixth grade.